October 18th, 2019

The Honorable Barbara Barrett Secretary of the Air Force United States Air Force 1670 Air Force Pentagon Washington DC, 20330-1670

Dear Secretary Barrett,

I represent the 76th State Assembly District of Wisconsin, which contains some of the communities most negatively impacted by the proposal to commission F-35 jets at the Truax Air National Guard Base in Madison, Wisconsin. I am writing to request from the Air Force information and answers to the questions I have regarding this proposal, and the many concerns I have heard from constituents who live in the impacted communities. I have attached all of the questions I have, in addition to previous correspondence addressed to Acting Secretary Donovan to which I never received a response.

The biggest area of concern currently is the insufficiency of the information contained in the U.S. Air Force's draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and incorporated documents. Simply put, these documents fail to answer the three key questions my community has: 1) How much louder will the F-35 jets be; 2) What areas will be impacted under different scenarios including varying afterburner usage; and 3) How frequently and when will this expected loudness occur? None of these documents clearly answer these fundamental questions regarding the increase and duration in noise F-35s pose to my community. My understanding is that the U.S. Air Force has the ability to run additional models and sound graphs that would be far more helpful than using the average sound decibel over a 24 hour period day night average (DNL). I specifically am asking for additional noise contour graphs as set forth in my enclosed list of needed documents and questions.

As indicated in the attached document, there is also important information that was included in the Burlington, Vermont EIS that is not included in the Truax EIS, including a comparison of the F-35 and F-16 in terms of the noise intensity. That comparison shows the F-35 jets to be four times louder for the Burlington community than the current F-16 jets, which is a helpful measure for a community trying to evaluate the proposal.

The little relevant information presented is divided up into many dense documents, including the full draft EIS, a Final Noise evaluation and various appendices. For example, information about intense aircraft noise effects on children is not described until Appendix E to the Final Noise report, which is not specific to Truax but seems to apply to all sites. Comparison graphs, such as current and proposed DNL Contours are separated by 7 pages, making a side by side comparison for the average person more difficult. The draft EIS in general seems to violate the Department of Defense Noise Technical Working groups own guidelines (2009) that state:

"Most project stakeholders and the general public do not want to wade through pages of technical data. They respond most positively and proceed more quickly toward project completion when the most straight-forward noise exposure data is presented in the main text with the detailed tabular data in an appendix for those wishing to see the complete technical information" (p. 14)

The result is that it is almost impossible for a layperson to digest and comprehend what little relevant information is presented.

Please let me know if you have any questions. My community is anxious to receive more information, and I look forward to receiving your responses to these critical questions.

Sincerely,

Representative Chris Taylor 76th Assembly District

Chris Juf